REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested based upon the remarks below. By this Amendment, Figs. 1, 2, 4A, and 4B are amended; and claims 1-10, and 12 are amended.

Figs. 1, 2, 4A, and 4B are objected to based upon informalities. Specifically, the figures have labels that are handwritten. Replacement Figs. 1, 2, 4A, and 4B are submitted herewith and accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that claims 1 and 12 state "logically protected computer environments (or 'compartments')." The Office Action requests selection of one term or the other. Accordingly, claims 1 and 12 are amended to recite a "logically protected computing compartment" to obviate the objection thereto. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 1-12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the PTO asserts, on page 3 of the Office Action, that "these claims use the language 'means for' without a corresponding structure in the specification." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, involves a determination of whether the claim apprises one of ordinary skill in the art of the claim scope, i.e., whether the claims set out and circumscribe a particular subject matter with a reasonable degree of clarity and particularity. At paragraph [0023] of the specification, Applicants disclose, wherein:

> "A trusted computing platform of a type generally suitable for carrying out an embodiment of the present invention is described in detail in the applicant's International Patent Application No. PCT/GB00/00528 entitled

`Trusted Computing Platform` and filed on 15th February 2000, the contents of which are incorporated herein by reference. The PCT document describes the essential elements of a trusted computing platform...."

Furthermore, at paragraph [0025], Applicants disclose that when:

"[r]eferring to FIG. 2 of the drawings, the motherboard 20 of the trusted computing platform 10 includes (among other standard components) a main processor 21, main memory 22, a trusted device 24, a data bus 26 and respective control lines 27 and address lines 28, BIOS memory 29 containing the BIOS program (which, after reset, builds a proper environment within which the operating system program will be run) for the platform 10, and input/output (I/O) device 23, which controls interaction between the components of the motherboard and the smart card reader 12, the keyboard 14, the mouse 16 and the VDU 18. The main memory 22 is typically random access memory (RAM). In operation, the platform 10 loads the operating system into RAM from hard disk (not shown)."

Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 8, 9, and 11 reasonably set out and the specification circumscribes the particular subject matter to support the "means for" language recited in the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 9, and 11 is respectfully requested.

The PTO further rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,216,369 to Wiseman et al. ("Wiseman") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229794 to Sutton, II et al. ("Sutton"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined disclosures of Wiseman and Sutton do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a system comprising a trusted computer platform that includes at least one first logically protected computing compartment, at least one second logically protected computing compartment, and at least one security

rule, "wherein the at least one security rule relating to the at least one second logically protected computing compartment is only arranged to be loaded onto said trusted computing platform if one or more services or processes associated therewith are enabled." (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 1.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the PTO asserts that Wiseman, at column 4, lines 42-55 and 62-67, discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree. At lines column 4, lines 42-55, Wiseman appears to only disclose an alert signal 136 that is generated when a policy is violated, and column 4, lines 62-67, appear only to disclose initialization code 148 that compares the overall configuration and load sequences of the platform at the time of initialization. Nowhere does Wiseman disclose, teach, or suggest, wherein a security code is only loaded "if one or more services or processes are enabled," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). In other words, Applicants recite a system that loads security rules at initialization and when services are enabled, while Wiseman appears to only disclose a system that initiates policies at initialization only.

Sutton appears only to disclose a system for permitting the execution of system management code, and likewise fails to suggest loading a security rule when a service or policy is enabled.

Independent claim 12 is a method claim based upon the system recited in claim 1 and Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable due to the failure of Wiseman in view of Sutton to disclose, teach or motivate all recited features of the claims. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are likewise patentable over the applied art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features it/they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Wray *et al.*

Kenneth M. Berner

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
703-684-1111 Telephone
970-898-0640 Telecopier
Date: September 13, 2007
KMB/ERM/mkl